



**U.S. Department of Justice**

*United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York*

---

*The Silvio J. Mollo Building  
One Saint Andrew's Plaza  
New York, New York 10007*

July 2, 2019

Gary A. Peters, Esq.  
450 West Fourth Street  
Royal Oak, MI 48067  
gpeters@howardandhoward.com

**Re: *United States v. John Lambert*, 19 Mag. 3608**

Dear Mr. Peters:

On the understandings specified below, the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York (“this Office”) will accept a guilty plea from John Lambert (“the defendant”) to Count One of the above-captioned Information, which charges the defendant with one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349. Count One carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years; a maximum term of supervised release of three years; a maximum fine, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3571, of the greatest of \$250,000, twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense, or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than the defendant resulting from the offense; and a \$100 mandatory special assessment. In addition to the foregoing, the Court must order restitution as specified below.

In consideration of the defendant’s plea to the above offense, the defendant will not be further prosecuted criminally by this Office (except for criminal tax violations, if any, as to which this Office cannot, and does not, make any agreement) for his participation in a scheme to defraud consumers of legal advice and services from in or about August 2016 through in or about April 2018, as alleged in Count One of the Information, it being understood that this agreement does not bar the use of such conduct as a predicate act or as the basis for a sentencing enhancement in a subsequent prosecution including, but not limited to, a prosecution pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961 *et seq.*

In addition, at the time of sentencing, the Government will move to dismiss any open Count(s) against the defendant. The defendant agrees that with respect to any and all dismissed charges he is not a “prevailing party” within the meaning of the “Hyde Amendment,” Section 617, P.L. 105-119 (Nov. 26, 1997), and will not file any claim under that law.

The defendant hereby admits the forfeiture allegation with respect to Count One of the Information and agrees to forfeit to the United States, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), a sum of money equal to \$46,654.50 in United States currency, representing proceeds traceable to the commission of said offense (the “Money Judgment”). It is further understood that any forfeiture of the defendant’s

assets shall not be treated as satisfaction of any fine, restitution, cost of imprisonment, or any other penalty the Court may impose upon him in addition to forfeiture. The defendant consents to the entry of the Consent Order of Forfeiture annexed hereto as Exhibit A and agrees that the Consent Order of Forfeiture shall be final as to the defendant at the time it is ordered by the Court.

The defendant further agrees to make restitution in the amount of \$46,654.50 in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3663A.

In consideration of the foregoing and pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines (“U.S.S.G.” or “Guidelines”) Section 6B1.4, the parties hereby stipulate to the following:

A. Offense Level

1. The applicable Guidelines manual is the November 2018 version.
2. The base offense level is seven, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1(a)(1).
3. A six-level enhancement is warranted under U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1(b)(1)(D), because the loss was more than \$40,000, but less than \$95,000.
4. A two-level enhancement is warranted under U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1(b)(2)(A), both because the offense involved 10 or more victims and resulted in financial hardship to one or more victims.
5. A two-level enhancement is warranted under U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1(b)(10), because the offense involved sophisticated means and the defendant intentionally engaged in or caused the conduct constituting sophisticated means.
6. Assuming the defendant were to clearly demonstrate acceptance of responsibility, to the satisfaction of the Government, through his allocution and subsequent conduct prior to the imposition of sentence, a two-level reduction would be warranted, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(a). Furthermore, assuming the defendant were to accept responsibility as described in the previous sentence, the Government would move at sentencing for an additional one-level reduction, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b), because the defendant would have given timely notice of his intention to enter a plea of guilty, thereby permitting the Government to avoid preparing for trial and permitting the Court to allocate its resources efficiently.

In accordance with the foregoing calculations, the applicable offense level is 14.

B. Criminal History Category

Based upon the information now available to this Office, including representations by the defense, the defendant has zero criminal history points. In accordance with the foregoing, the defendant’s Criminal History Category is I.

C. Sentencing Range

Based upon the calculations set forth above, the defendant's sentencing range is 15 to 21 months' imprisonment. In addition, after determining the defendant's ability to pay, the Court may impose a fine pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 5E1.2. At offense level 14, the applicable fine range is \$7,500 to \$75,000.

The parties agree that neither a downward nor an upward departure from the Stipulated Guidelines Range set forth above is warranted. Accordingly, neither party will seek any departure or adjustment pursuant to the Guidelines that is not set forth herein. Nor will either party in any way suggest that the Probation Office or the Court consider such a departure or adjustment under the Guidelines.

The parties agree that either party may seek a sentence outside of the Stipulated Guidelines Range based upon the factors to be considered in imposing a sentence pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

Except as provided in any written Proffer Agreement(s) that may have been entered into between this Office and the defendant, nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the parties (i) to present to the Probation Office or the Court any facts relevant to sentencing; (ii) to make any arguments regarding where within the Stipulated Guidelines Range (or such other range as the Court may determine) the defendant should be sentenced and regarding the factors to be considered in imposing a sentence pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a); (iii) to seek an appropriately adjusted Guidelines range if it is determined based upon new information that the defendant's criminal history category is different from that set forth above; and (iv) to seek an appropriately adjusted Guidelines range or mandatory minimum term of imprisonment if it is subsequently determined that the defendant qualifies as a career offender under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1. Nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the Government to seek denial of the adjustment for acceptance of responsibility, *see* U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1, regardless of any stipulation set forth above, if the defendant fails clearly to demonstrate acceptance of responsibility, to the satisfaction of the Government, through his allocution and subsequent conduct prior to the imposition of sentence. Similarly, nothing in this Agreement limits the right of the Government to seek an enhancement for obstruction of justice, *see* U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, regardless of any stipulation set forth above, should it be determined that the defendant has either (i) engaged in conduct, unknown to the Government at the time of the signing of this Agreement, that constitutes obstruction of justice or (ii) committed another crime after signing this Agreement.

It is understood that pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 6B1.4(d), neither the Probation Office nor the Court is bound by the above Guidelines stipulation, either as to questions of fact or as to the determination of the proper Guidelines to apply to the facts. In the event that the Probation Office or the Court contemplates any Guidelines adjustments, departures, or calculations different from those stipulated to above, or contemplates any sentence outside of the stipulated Guidelines range, the parties reserve the right to answer any inquiries and to make all appropriate arguments concerning the same.

It is understood that the sentence to be imposed upon the defendant is determined solely by the Court. It is further understood that the Guidelines are not binding on the Court. The defendant acknowledges that his entry of a guilty plea to the charged offenses authorizes the sentencing court to impose any sentence, up to and including the statutory maximum sentence. This Office cannot, and does not, make any promise or representation as to what sentence the defendant will receive. Moreover, it is understood that the defendant will have no right to withdraw his plea of guilty should the sentence imposed by the Court be outside the Guidelines range set forth above.

It is agreed (i) that the defendant will not file a direct appeal, nor bring a collateral challenge, including but not limited to an application under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2255 and/or Section 2241, of any sentence within or below the Stipulated Guidelines Range of 15 to 21 months' imprisonment, and (ii) that the Government will not appeal any sentence within or above the Stipulated Guidelines Range. This provision is binding on the parties even if the Court employs a Guidelines analysis different from that stipulated to herein. Furthermore, it is agreed that any appeal as to the defendant's sentence that is not foreclosed by this provision will be limited to that portion of the sentencing calculation that is inconsistent with (or not addressed by) the above stipulation. The parties agree that this waiver applies regardless of whether the term of imprisonment is imposed to run consecutively to or concurrently with the undischarged portion of any other sentence of imprisonment that has been imposed on the defendant at the time of sentencing in this case. The defendant further agrees not to appeal any term of supervised release that is less than or equal to the statutory maximum. The defendant also agrees not to appeal any fine that is less than or equal to \$75,000, or any restitution amount or forfeiture amount that is less than or equal to \$46,654.50, and the Government agrees not to appeal any fine that is greater than or equal to \$7,500, or any restitution amount or forfeiture amount that is greater than or equal to \$46,654.50. The defendant also agrees not to appeal any special assessment that is less than or equal to \$100. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to be a waiver of whatever rights the defendant may have to assert claims of ineffective assistance of counsel, whether on direct appeal, collateral review, or otherwise. Rather, it is expressly agreed that the defendant reserves those rights.

The defendant hereby acknowledges that he has accepted this Agreement and decided to plead guilty because he is in fact guilty. By entering this plea of guilty, the defendant waives any and all right to withdraw his plea or to attack his conviction, either on direct appeal or collaterally, on the ground that the Government has failed to produce any discovery material, Jencks Act material, exculpatory material pursuant to *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), other than information establishing the factual innocence of the defendant, or impeachment material pursuant to *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), that has not already been produced as of the date of the signing of this Agreement.

The defendant recognizes that, if he is not a citizen of the United States, his guilty plea and conviction make it very likely that his removal from the United States is presumptively mandatory and that, at a minimum, he is at risk of being removed or suffering other adverse immigration consequences. If the defendant is a naturalized citizen of the United States, he recognizes that pleading guilty may have consequences with respect to the defendant's immigration status. For

example, under federal law, an individual may be subject to denaturalization and removal if his naturalization was procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, or otherwise illegally procured. The defendant acknowledges that he has discussed the possible immigration consequences (including removal or denaturalization) of his guilty plea and conviction with defense counsel. The defendant affirms that he wants to plead guilty regardless of any immigration or denaturalization consequences that may result from the guilty plea and conviction, even if those consequences include denaturalization and/or removal from the United States. The defendant understands that denaturalization and other immigration consequences are typically the subject of a separate proceeding, and the defendant understands that no one, including his attorney or the District Court, can predict with certainty the effect of the defendant's conviction on the defendant's immigration or naturalization status. It is agreed that the defendant will have no right to withdraw his guilty plea based on any actual or perceived adverse immigration consequences (including removal or denaturalization) resulting from the guilty plea and conviction. It is further agreed that the defendant will not challenge his conviction or sentence on direct appeal, or through litigation under Title 28, United States Code, Section 2255 and/or Section 2241, on the basis of any actual or perceived adverse immigration consequences (including removal or denaturalization) resulting from his guilty plea and conviction.

It is further agreed that should the conviction(s) following the defendant's plea(s) of guilty pursuant to this Agreement be vacated for any reason, then any prosecution that is not time-barred by the applicable statute of limitations on the date of the signing of this agreement (including any counts that the Government has agreed to dismiss at sentencing pursuant to this Agreement) may be commenced or reinstated against the defendant, notwithstanding the expiration of the statute of limitations between the signing of this Agreement and the commencement or reinstatement of such prosecution. It is the intent of this Agreement to waive all defenses based on the statute of limitations with respect to any prosecution that is not time-barred on the date that this Agreement is signed.

It is further understood that this Agreement does not bind any federal, state, or local prosecuting authority other than this Office.


[SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Apart from any written Proffer Agreement(s) that may have been entered into between this Office and defendant, this Agreement supersedes any prior understandings, promises, or conditions between this Office and the defendant. No additional understandings, promises, or conditions have been entered into other than those set forth in this Agreement, and none will be entered into unless in writing and signed by all parties.

Very truly yours,

GEOFFREY S. BERMAN  
United States Attorney

By:

  
Benjamin Woodside Schrier  
Assistant United States Attorney  
(212) 637-1062

APPROVED:

  
Rebecca Mermelstein  
Co-Chief, General Crimes Unit

AGREED AND CONSENTED TO:

---

JOHN LAMBERT

---

DATE

APPROVED:

---

GARY A. PETERS  
Attorney for JOHN LAMBERT

---

DATE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x  
:  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :  
- v. - : **INFORMATION**  
:  
JOHN LAMBERT, : 19 Cr.  
a/k/a "Eric Pope," :  
:  
Defendant. :  
:  
-----x

**COUNT ONE**

(Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud)

The United States Attorney charges:

1. From at least in or about August 2016, up to and including at least in or about April 2018, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, JOHN LAMBERT, a/k/a "Eric Pope," the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together and with each other to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

2. It was a part and object of the conspiracy that JOHN LAMBERT, a/k/a "Eric Pope," the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly, having devised and intending to devise a scheme or artifice to defraud and for obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, would and did transmit and cause

to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, and television communication in interstate and foreign commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds, for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349.)

**FORFEITURE ALLEGATION**

3. As a result of committing the offense alleged in Count One of this Information, JOHN LAMBERT, a/k/a "Eric Pope," the defendant, shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), and Title 28 United States Code, Section 2461(c), any and all property, real and personal, that constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the commission of said offense, including but not limited to a sum of money in United States currency representing the amount of proceeds traceable to the commission of said offense.

**Substitute Assets Provision**

4. If any of the above-described forfeitable property, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant:

- a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
- b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third person;
- c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;

- d. has been substantially diminished in value; or
- e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be subdivided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p), and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendant up to the value of the above forfeitable property.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 981; Title 21, United States Code, Section 853; and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461.)

Geoffrey S. Berman  
GEOFFREY S. BERMAN  
United States Attorney

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

- v. -

JOHN LAMBERT,  
a/k/a "Eric Pope,"

Defendant.

---

INFORMATION

19 Cr.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349)

GEOFFREY S. BERMAN

---

U.S. Attorney.

---

---